

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 12 are now pending in the application. Claims 4-11, 13, and 14 have been cancelled. The basis for the amendment can be found throughout the application, claims and drawings as originally filed and as such no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirtreiter et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,897,941). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirtreiter in view of Crabtree (U.S. Pat. No. 4,763,883). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of "said first and second cords being made from a material selected from a group consisting of aramid, nylon, polyester, textiles, or combinations thereof." Furthermore, the limitation of the sleeve having a torsional strain less than approximately 0.5 degrees has been eliminated. Applicants note that Hirtreiter et al '941 discloses a reinforced fluid spring. The Examiner specifically references the fluid spring construction disclosed in Figure 11 of the application. The Examiner asserts that Hirtreiter et al disclose "an elastomer body 1; a first cord 17 embedded in the elastomer body, the first cord wound with a first helix angle with respect to a sleeve centerline, a second cord 17 embedded in the elastomer body." Initially, Applicants note that the cords 17 as disclosed in the '941 patent are provided for deformation-resistant axially

oriented reinforcement and make up the reinforcement layer 16 (see col. 4, lines 53-col. 5, line 60). In particular, the cords 17 are defined as being made from high modulus metal filaments including fine stranded steel wire, high carbon steel cords or cables or can take other forms such as solid, rigid elements such as straight or crimped metal rods, bars, or slats of a relatively thin cross section which can be composed of any well known metallic materials such as steel, bronze, or aluminum (see col. 5, lines 5-26). The purpose of the metal cords 17 is to provide axial deformation-resisting reinforcement to the portion 31 of the air spring body 29 that is not intended to be deformed in the undesirable manner as illustrated in Figure 9A of the '941 patent.

Applicants submit that the cords 17, as disclosed in Hirtreiter et al '941 are not made from a material selected from the group consisting of aramid, nylon, polyester, textiles, or combinations thereof, and therefore, does not disclose or suggest the first and second cords as claimed.

Applicants further submit that the '941 patent discloses the metal cords 17 are contained in two bands or belts forming the layers 37 and 38 in which the cords of one band are disposed at a different angle with respect to the cords of the other band." Applicants note, however, that there is no teaching or suggestion that the cords of the inner layer have a greater helix angle than the cords of the outer layer, as claimed. Applicants further submit that the reference to a "different angle" merely indicates that the angles are taken on opposite sides of the axis such that the angle of one set of cords 17 has a positive angle while the other set of cords has a negative angle. This is confirmed by review of Figure 10 in which the cords 17, shown in the upper portion of the drawing, as part of layer 37 are disposed at an approximately 50 degree angle

relative to the axis A while the cords 17 making up layer 38, shown towards the bottom of the figure, are disposed at an angle of minus 50 degrees relative to the axis A. Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in the '941 patent for providing the cords 17 at different helix angle values, and there is, therefore, also no teaching or suggestion for having the inner cords at a greater helix angle than the outer cords. In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Applicant notes that claims 2, 3, and 12 depend from claim 1, and are therefore in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 12 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (734) 354-5445.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug. 16, 2005

By: Ronald W. Wangerow
Ronald W. Wangerow, Reg. No. 29,597

FREUDENBERG-NOK GENERAL PARTNERSHIP
Legal Department
47690 East Anchor Court
Plymouth, MI 48170-2455
Direct Line: (734) 354-5445
Facsimile: (734) 451-1445